

## **REMARKS**

In summary, claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 1-15 are objected as a method claims failing to recite steps. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and objections. No claims are amended. No new matter is added.

### **Telephone Conversation With Examiner**

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Patel for the telephone conversation conducted on August 6, 2007. Applicant's representative inquired about the status of claims 7-15, if the objection to claims 1-15 was overcome. Examiner Patel stated that claims 7-15 may be allowable.

### **Objection to Claims 1 – 15 Informality**

Claims 1- 15 are objected to, as asserted in the instant Office Action, because claim 1 is a method claim and that claim 1 does not recite steps. The same error is asserted to appear in claims 2-15.

Applicants respectfully refute the objection. Amended claim 1 is repeated below, wherein the verbs pertaining to steps are highlighted via underscore and bold.

A method for a processor of a computing device to obtain a trusted identification of a hardware peripheral of the computing device, the processor and the peripheral being coupled by a path through which data is to be exchanged therebetween, the method comprising:

the processor **requesting** by way of a trusted hardware channel that the peripheral provide the identification to such processor by way of such trusted channel, the trusted channel being independent of and exterior to the path;

the processor **receiving** by way of the trusted hardware channel the identification from the peripheral; and

the processor, having prior knowledge of the peripheral and the identification thereof, **concluding** based on the received identification by way of the trusted channel that the peripheral is indeed the peripheral and **imparting** trust to the peripheral based on such conclusion, and **exchanging** data with the peripheral over the path based on the identification.

As indicated above, claim 1 recites the steps of requesting, receiving, concluding, imparting, and exchanging. Accordingly, it is requested that the object to claims 1-15 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112**

As asserted in the instant Office Action, claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements that amount to a gap between the elements. Specifically, it is asserted that “For claim 1, the omitted elements ‘wherein the computing device includes a trusted hardware module (THM) physically interposed between the processor and the peripheral to form the trusted hardware channel therebetween, the THM being trusted to communicate with both the processor and the peripheral in a trusted manner over the trusted channel and being identifiable to the processor over the trusted channel, the method comprising:’.”

Applicants respectfully contend that no essential elements are omitted from claims 1-6. The allegedly omitted elements are directed to a trusted hardware module of a trusted hardware channel. Claim 1 is a method claim directed to a method that utilizes a trusted hardware channel. Claim 1 recites steps directed to “requesting by way of a trusted hardware channel” and “receiving by way of the trusted hardware channel.” This is supported in Applicants’ application (*See* for example, the first paragraph of the Summary Of The Invention; and page 12, line 30 through page 13, line 4.). No essential elements appear to be missing from the steps recited in claim 1.

Additionally, the allegedly omitted essential elements quoted in the instant Office Action, are found, verbatim, in claim 3. Thus, the allegedly omitted essential elements are found in claims 1-6. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, of claims 1-6 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2956/307058.01  
**Application No.:** 10/771,888  
**Office Action Dated:** July 2, 2007

**PATENT**

### **CONCLUSION**

It is requested that the forgoing amendments, arguments, and remarks be entered, and in view thereof, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow this application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: October 2, 2007

**/Joseph F. Oriti/**  
Joseph F. Oriti  
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439